

Developing a Sociocritical Literacy in the Third Space

Kris D. Gutiérrez

University of California, Los Angeles, USA

ABSTRACT

This essay argues for a paradigm shift in what counts as learning and literacy education for youth. Two related constructs are emphasized: collective Third Space and sociocritical literacy. The construct of a collective Third Space builds on an existing body of research and can be viewed as a particular kind of zone of proximal development. The perspective taken here challenges some current definitions of the zone of proximal development. A sociocritical literacy historicizes everyday and institutional literacy practices and texts and reframes them as powerful tools oriented toward critical social thought. The theoretical constructs described in this article derive from an empirical case study of the Migrant Student Leadership Institute (MSLI) at the University of California, Los Angeles. Within the learning ecology of the MSLI, a collective Third Space is interactionally constituted, in which traditional conceptions of academic literacy and instruction for students from nondominant communities are contested and replaced with forms of literacy that privilege and are contingent upon students' sociohistorical lives, both proximally and distally. Within the MSLI, hybrid language practices; the conscious use of social theory, play, and imagination; and historicizing literacy practices link the past, the present, and an imagined future.

The impetus for this article is to argue for a paradigm shift in what counts as schooling for youth in the United States. This work calls for, paraphrasing Luke (2003), a new vision organized around robust and equity-oriented criteria for creating a more just and democratic educational system in an increasingly complex, transnational, and hybrid world.¹ Such a vision entails re-designing what counts as teaching and learning of literacy for poor and immigrant youth whose education has been defined by “marketplace reforms”—that is, reforms that bring the business principles of efficiency, accountability, quality, and choice to establish the education agenda. Such reforms employ the “sameness as fairness” principle, making it easier to roll back small gains in educational equity and implement the “color blind” practices of English-only, one-size-fits-all curricula and policies and practices driven by high-stakes assessment (Crosland, 2004; Gutiérrez & Jaramillo, 2006). But rather than taking a pessimistic approach to counter the current conditions of a failing educational system, I present a case that I hope illustrates the transformative potential of a humanist and equity-oriented research agenda and project. To do so, I build on my previous conceptu-

al and empirical work to elaborate the theoretical concept of the Third Space and to ground this abstract construct in the concrete and material practices of a transformative learning environment to illustrate its potential (Davydov, 1988a, 1988b, 1988c, 1988d, 1988e).

I draw on empirical work from a long-term study of a project that brings high school students from migrant-farmworker backgrounds to the University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA) for a four-week summer residential program with a rich curriculum, dense with learning activity organized around sociocultural views of learning and development, a situated sociocritical literacy, and the related theoretical concept of the Third Space, the central focus of this article.² This noteworthy program at UCLA has unusual results academically and in terms of opening the educational pipeline for its participants, but the aspect I will focus on, and what interests me most, is the design of a particular social environment of development, a collective Third Space, in which students begin to reconceive who they are and what they might be able to accomplish academically and beyond. At the core of its political–philosophical roots, this program is oriented toward a form of “cosmopolitanism” (Appiah, 2006) char-

acterized by the ideals and practices of a shared humanity, a profound obligation to others, boundary crossing, and intercultural exchange in which difference is celebrated without being romanticized.

I present the development of a particular learning ecology to illustrate how the accomplishment of a Third Space is mediated by a range of tools, including what I have termed a “sociocritical literacy” (Gutiérrez, 2002)—that is, a historicizing literacy that privileges and is contingent upon students’ sociohistorical lives, both proximally and distally. Thus, my work with youth from nondominant communities³ has necessarily emphasized the development of literacies in which everyday and institutional literacies are reframed into powerful literacies (Hamilton, 1997) oriented toward critical social thought. A distinguishing feature of sociocritical literacy is its attention to contradictions in and between texts lived and studied, institutions (e.g., the classroom, the academy), and sociocultural practices, locally experienced and historically influenced. The importance of historicity here demonstrates an alignment with cultural–historical approaches to learning and development. A sociocritical literacy stands in stark contrast to current forms of academic literacy available to students from nondominant communities. Academic literacy is often narrowly conceived, although a sociocritical literacy emerges in discursive and embodied practices including writing, reading, and performative activities with transformative ends. Of significance to the discussion in this article, school-based literacies generally emphasize ahistorical and vertical forms of learning and are oriented toward weak literacies (Gutiérrez & Larson, 2007).

This distinction is important, as I will discuss how learning in the Third Space attends to both vertical *and* horizontal forms of learning, resulting in more robust and historicizing literacies. A focus on vertical and horizontal forms of expertise is congruous with the hybrid character of the Third Space. Briefly, traditional notions of development generally define change along a vertical dimension, moving, for example, from immaturity and incompetence to maturity and competence (Engeström, 1996). A more expansive view of development also is concerned with the horizontal forms of expertise that develop within and across an individual’s practices (Gutiérrez & Larson, 2007). I believe the notion of repertoires of practice captures both vertical and horizontal forms of expertise (Gutiérrez & Rogoff, 2003); this includes not only what students learn in formal learning environments such as schools, but also what they learn by participating in a range of practices outside of school.

I also will call attention to a rich interactional matrix, constituted by a range of language and embodied practices, including particular grammatical practices that

promote Third Spaces and mediate the achievement of coordinated action around deep forms of learning. In elaborating the concept of the Third Space, I push on popular notions of the related concept of the zone of proximal development (ZPD; Vygotsky, 1978) and the ways the learning sciences account for learning and development of youth from nondominant communities.

“Rising to the Concrete”⁴

To ground this theoretical concept, I turn to Ave⁵, a wise 16-year-old migrant student, who agreed to let me weave her story throughout this piece. Her words exemplify, in ways that I cannot begin to capture, how poverty, discrimination, exploitation, anti-immigrant sentiment, language ideologies, and educational and social policies gone awry complicate current understandings in the learning sciences about learning and development. I draw from her “autobiography,” written as part of a process of developing a sociocritical literacy for social action among high school students participating in the program I mentioned earlier, the UCLA Migrant Student Leadership Institute (henceforth MSLI or the Migrant Institute).

It is important to insert a conceptual note before presenting Ave’s text. The autobiography was initially conceived in the program as a tool for developing new beginnings in highly personal and idiosyncratic ways although oriented toward transformative ends, individually and collectively, educationally and sociopolitically (Espinoza, 2003). Subsequently, the autobiography as originally conceived was elaborated and revised over time by a number of instructional staff members. The text and its processes of production evolved into a hybrid form of critical autobiography and *testimonio*, a “syncretic *testimonio*” (C. Cruz, personal communication, November 24, 2007) situated in the subjective particularity and global and historical reality in which people coconstruct their understanding of the social world and of themselves (Jaramillo, 2007). In this way, the production of the text is an ecologically valid developmental task developed in the cognitive, social, and historical realities and practices of all the participants, young and old, in the Migrant Institute.

Further, the syncretic *testimonio* is a hybrid text, a sociopolitical narrative shared orally and witnessed in an intimate and respectful learning community and, at the same time, written using the traditional conventions of academic texts and the editorial assistance of peers and instructors to develop students’ new understandings about themselves and their relations to the immediate and the larger social world. As a hybrid text, the

syncretic *testimonio* is constituted with several seemingly contradictory or inharmonious conventions and practices—the performance of the *testimonio* and its construction as written text (Cruz, 2007). The production of a sociocritical literacy and social critical thought is facilitated by mediational tools readily available in the learning ecology.

Each student's syncretic *testimonio*, then, is a coproduction, imbued with the author's story and life history and also with those of other students, the institute's staff, and certainly my own, mediated by a sociocritical literacy and a network of social relations and pedagogical arrangements. Thus, as Cruz (2006) and Stoll (1999) have cautioned, science positions itself in studies of non-dominant communities as a colonial project. I acknowledge and work self-consciously within this double bind.

In constructing the syncretic *testimonio*, students in the MSLI use social theory and an emergent sociocritical literacy to locate and relocate their experiences in a personal, political, and cultural–historical context. Thus, the text and its production are at once personal, socially mediated, and, hence, heteroglossic—situated both locally and historically. From this perspective, a sociocritical literacy is a syncretic literacy organized around a pedagogical approach that focuses on how individuals and their communities influence and are influenced by social, political, and cultural discourses and practices in historically specific times and locations (Cruz, 2006).

Learning as Movement

Migrant students' stories of movements across borders, across both new and familiar practices, calls our attention to an important and unresolved dilemma in the learning sciences: How do we account for the learning and development embodied by and through movement, the border and boundary crossing of students who migrate to and throughout the U.S.? What new capacities and identities are developed in this movement? To what extent do these capacities and identities travel and shift across settings? And what new educational arrangements provoke and support new capacities that extend students' repertoires of practice?

In the context of the MSLI, hybrid language practices in which students use their complete linguistic tool kit in the service of learning and the production of texts such as the syncretic *testimonio* bring horizontal forms of learning, the movement, into students' understandings of texts, social theory, and writing conventions. In what follows, we will learn how Ave wrote and negotiated her way through the paradoxes of immigration, migration, schooling, and living in the United States. She begins

her text, entitled "Silent Life," by recalling life as a young child in Oaxaca, Mexico:

At sixteen she [my mother] got married to someone she didn't know because my grandmother, Virginia, thought that being sixteen was too old.

A year later, in 1987, I was born in the miniscule town of San Martin, Oaxaca. According to my mother, I was dead, but many say I was half dead. So what did they do? They wrapped me up in a blanket and tossed me up until I awoke.

I lived in that town for four years and I can recall waking up to a tree branch filled with spider webs and the smell of tortillas, which we ate with either salt or bugs. I also remembered taking cold showers in a gigantic room filled with frogs, as well as the day my parents took me to see the dead body of my 90-year-old grandfather.

My mom said doctors and nurses visited her to taste her food. My father, on the other hand, was a devoted carpenter who at times was randomly chosen to be mayor of the 800-people town. Then my grandmother heard of "El Norte" and left. We soon followed. I arrived in California in the trunk of a car. If ever I understood the definition of confusion, it was then. I had no idea of where I was and how I got there but I was finally there—the New World. It was filled with cars, TVs and above all, poverty. My family lived in a garage after being thrown out of my aunt's house because she felt our family was consuming her children's food. Interestingly enough, we were extremely thin and most of her children were overweight. (Ave's *testimonio*, July 2004)

This issue of what it means to learn in familiar, new, and overlapping contexts, in rapidly shifting practices and communities, to understand how the social organization of these environments facilitates or interferes with cognitive work, including how people are made smart by the use of artifacts and participation in particular social groups and settings, is central to the work I address in this article. People live their lives and learn across multiple settings, and this holds true not only across the span of their lives but also across and within the institutions and communities they inhabit—even classrooms, for example. I take an approach that urges me to consider the significant overlap across these boundaries as people, tools, and practices travel through different and even contradictory contexts and activities (Engeström, 1996; Street, 2005). It is from this perspective that we begin to understand the cultural dimensions of learning and development that occur as "people, ideas, and practices of different communities meet, collide, and merge" (Engeström, 2005, p. 46).

Many of us who are interested in the cultural dimensions of learning take an approach that resists the binaries of home and school, of formal and informal learning, and instead focus on what takes hold as children and youth move in and across the various settings and contexts of

their everyday lives (see Kulick & Stroud, 1993; Scollon & Scollon, 2003; Tuomi-Gröhn & Engeström, 2003). This approach allows for the identification of both possibility and constraint within and across contexts (Cole & Engeström, 1993; Engeström, 2005; Gutiérrez, 2004).

For more than a decade, I have been involved in several social design experiments with students for whom English is not the home language. Clearly, these projects grow out of my own social, political, and intellectual orientations and experiences. The UCLA Migrant Student Leadership Institute, the context for Ave's syncretic *testimonio*, has been one setting for this work.⁶ Briefly, the MSLI enrolls primarily Latino students (with a small number of Filipino, Vietnamese, and Hmong) who engage daily from 8:00 a.m. to midnight in a range of academic activities, including reading and writing embedded in the study of social theory, science⁷, **tutorials, writing conferences, comprehension circles, teatro del oprimido (theater of the oppressed), and college preparatory workshops, all offered in relation to a historicized view of the students' own sociocultural situation.** In designing these activities, institute staff has rejected traditional mismatch theories of home and school discontinuities. Such frameworks reinscribe deficit portraits of home that compel educators to "fix" communities and their members so that they match normative views and practices without regard to students' existing repertoires of practice (Gutiérrez & Rogoff, 2003) or to the additional set of challenges poor immigrant youth experience. I would argue that a more productive framework and method of study traces students' movement across their daily routines to understand what tools and resources are taken up or are available across the practices that give meaning to everyday life. Paraphrasing Street (2005, p. 2), I would ask, What additional set of challenges do students from nondominant groups address as they move across home, school, and other community settings and interact with family members, teachers, peers, and other adults who also bring "sedimented" features of their life's activities and experiences to bear on their ways of interacting and participating? Within this approach, poor children, especially those from nondominant groups, would be expected to have both similar and distinct developmental challenges when compared to their more privileged peers. Allow me to return briefly to Ave's story to help illustrate this point.

When my mom figured out how to send me to school she did and thus began my silence. I grew up believing I was invisible and I learned that my vocation was that of an outside observer. Everything I accomplished in school was ignored. In school, kids spoke in English about me because they thought I did not understand, but I did. They used English to insult everything about me and I learned to look down on Mexicans.

Since I was small and felt so insignificant, I had no friends and people succeeded in making me invisible. I learned to simply observe everything and everyone, but even that bothered people. I was never taught to fight, so instead I did what I was best at, stay quiet and take it all in. The silence somehow sent them the message that I was dumb and stupid. People of my own race would call me Oaxaquita with so much disgust that although I did not know the word, I could understand their meaning. They said it was to cause me pain and shame. Sadly it did. (Ave's *testimonio*, July 2004)

We learn from students like Ave that racism, discrimination, and poverty intensify the consequences of inequitable schooling conditions. The vulnerability of migrant farmworkers like Ave and members of her community is particularly significant. For example, if we hold poverty constant, we find that migrant children who are also English learners are most vulnerable in terms of their health, well-being, employment, and educational opportunities (Bell, Roach, & Sheets, 1994; Huang, 1993). Consider that the average life expectancy of a migrant farmworker residing in the United States is 49 years (Oregon Health & Science University, 2001), although the average life expectancy in the United States generally is 76 years (United Nations Development Programme, 2001). Migrant farmworker children, then, are disproportionately at risk along a number of important dimensions, and their developmental trajectories must be understood in relation to these risk factors, including the significant risks created by racism, mobility, border crossing, toxic environmental workplaces and communities, inferior schools, and educational and social policies that exacerbate these conditions.

In my work I have tried to tease out some of these relationships and to figure out what meaning this movement across and within tasks, events, and interactions has for learning and development, as well as how to make this evident to others. Implicit here is a method that encourages us to examine a minimum of two interacting contexts or activities to produce more complicated understandings of how the social organization of people's everyday practices supports and constrains people's cognitive and social development (Engeström, 2005; Griffin & Cole, 1987).

One of the things I would like to do here is to juxtapose Ave's everyday experiences with her experience in a social design experiment, an artifact-rich environment, to discuss a particular set of processes that produce a relationship between social and individual functioning in what my colleagues and I termed the Third Space (Gutiérrez, Rymes, & Larson, 1995), as a window to understanding why certain contexts of development become particularly meaningful to their participants over time.⁸ I will return to this point shortly.

Revisiting the Third Space

My own thinking about the Third Space had its genesis in observing closely the differences in involvement, participation, and learning of students in classroom instructional activity and noting multiple social spaces with distinctive participation structures and power relations (Gutiérrez, 1993, 1994, 1995). It was these analyses that also pushed me to attend to contradictions and to rethink a strict temporal analysis of classrooms—that is, a diachronic view of talk and interaction in classroom activity—to a view of classrooms as having multiple, layered, and conflicting activity systems with various interconnections. What intrigued me most were the borderlines of those activities, what we later referred to as the “underlife” of the classroom (drawing on Goffman, 1961), and the remarkable sense-making character of those seemingly unrelated processes, what we called the “script” and “counterscript” from which Third Spaces emerge (Gutiérrez, 1993). In those early conceptualizations, we proposed the idea of a Third Space where teacher and student scripts—the formal and informal, the official and unofficial spaces of the learning environment—intersect, creating the potential for authentic interaction and a shift in the social organization of learning and what counts as knowledge (Gutiérrez et al., 1995). By following the threads of language, topics, interaction, and engagement within and across the multiple spaces and subject positions, we noted points of mutual attention, harmony, conflict, and disruption; we also noted short cycles of learning that held the potential for deeper or transformative forms of learning, as well as the difficulty of sustaining such cycles (Gutiérrez, Baquedano-López, & Tejada, 1999).

Those early musings about the multiple social spaces of the classroom I now understand as an argument about the importance of accounting for the interacting activity systems of people’s everyday lives. By attending to the microgenetic processes of everyday learning across a range of contexts, with one eye focused on the collective and the other on individual sense-making activity, we can note new forms of activity, stimulated by unresolved tensions or dilemmas, that can lead to rich cycles of learning—or what Engeström (1987) calls “expansive” learning.

In following these threads I have been motivated to understand better how people, especially youth, appropriate cultural concepts as they move in and across a range of social practices—attending to the ways boundary crossing reinforces, extends, and conflicts with individuals’ dispositions and repertoires of practice—and to understand better what takes hold in this movement. This focus has helped me identify productive and un-

productive aspects of learning cycles, to see the sites of possibility and contradiction, and to document the processes that lead to learning—that is, processes marked by new forms of participation and activity that change both the individual and the practice, as well as their mutual relation.

In this way, our use of the Third Space construct (contrary to the various interpretations it has attracted; e.g., Moje et al., 2004) has always been more than a celebration of the local literacies of students from nondominant groups; and certainly more than what students can do with assistance or scaffolding; and also more than ahistorical accounts of individual discrete events, literacy practices, and the social interaction within. Instead, it is a transformative space where the potential for an expanded form of learning and the development of new knowledge are heightened.

In that earlier work, we did not talk explicitly about learning and development but rather about their potential. Thus, a discussion of the relation of the Third Space and learning is warranted.

Third Spaces as Zones of Proximal Development

The notion of the zone of proximal development (Vygotsky, 1978) is useful for understanding how I have come to conceptualize the Third Space over time. Mindful of Chaiklin’s (2003) very instructive discussion of the misunderstandings of the ZPD and of Griffin and Cole’s (1984) observation about the limitations of a narrow view of the ZPD as a space of productive adult-centered scaffolding—a view advanced primarily by U.S. scholars—I believe the Third Space meets several basic criteria of “zo-peds.” (I use Cole’s [personal communication, 2005] term of *zo-ped*, where *zo* is an African word for “shaman” or “wise man” and, of course, *ped* refers to “pedagogy”; hence, “the pedagogy of a wise man.”) First, we can document in Third Spaces a reorganization—a movement, if you will—of everyday concepts into “scientific” (Vygotsky, 1978) or school-based concepts. Second, leading activities significant to individuals’ subsequent development, specifically play and the imaginary situation, learning, and affiliation, reorganize everyday functioning—the movement—in the Third Space. Through an orchestration of participation in a rich set of carefully designed, ecologically grounded practices, we can regulate the occurrence, frequency, and difficulty of specific problem-solving environments, as well as the forms of mediation available. And third, we can account for development as the transformation of the individual, the individual’s relation to the social environment, and the environment itself (Cole, 1985; Laboratory of

Comparative Human Cognition, 1983). In this article, I use the UCLA Migrant Institute to illustrate these points.

Within this perspective, development involves what Brown et al. (1993) call “mutual appropriation” in which the individual and her sociocultural environment actively seek to change the other to their own ends. Clearly, this process of transformation is anything but harmonious, and it is the inherent continuities and discontinuities among individual and environment and the larger system that, in part, I have been attempting to account for in theorizing the Third Space.

Yet although trying to hold to the basic tenets of Vygotskian notions of the zone, I have been dissatisfied with how current articulations of learning and development account (or not) for the new capacities and transformations that occur in students such as Ave, whose expanding tool kits somehow do not figure in these articulations. I am unsure if, as Engeström (1987) suggests, the concept of the ZPD itself is in need of significant remediation (Cole & Griffin, 1986) or if, as Moll (1990; Moll & Greenberg, 1990) suggests, it may be in need of renovations and improvements that do not alter its classical structure. I am hopeful that this article’s discussion of a collective Third Space will encourage attention to the learning and development that happen in the movement across various temporal, spatial, and historical dimensions of activity. One important and compatible view with my own theorizing about the Third Space expands the basic notion of the zo-ped to account for the “collaboration of different activity systems” (Tuomi-Gröhn, 2003, p. 200), not just the collaboration of individuals, to create what Engeström and colleagues describe as interdependent zones of proximal development (Engeström, 1987, 1994; Tuomi-Gröhn & Engeström, 2003; Tuomi-Gröhn, Engeström, & Young, 2003).

In line with this thinking, I have been intrigued by what sparks and sustains robust cycles of learning and what gets appropriated, created, and rejected by individuals and collectives. For example, in earlier work, I focused on how Third Spaces came into existence in classrooms. I was drawn to the distinct forms of talk, interaction, and forms of assistance and resistance, to the “script” and “counterscript,” and to the affordances of the social and spatial organization of the learning environment (Gutierrez, Rymes, & Larson, 1995; Gutierrez, Baquedano-Lopez, & Tejada, 1999). Although language practices have been an important focus throughout this work, recently I have become increasingly interested in examining more closely the role of language and embodied practices in the constitution of Third Spaces. I have become particularly interested in the grammar at work in the construction of Third Spaces and discuss in what follows some emergent ideas in this area. In my analysis, I

draw on an “interactional view of grammar” that posits that the properties of grammar are shaped by tasks posed in interaction (Ochs, Schegloff, & Thompson, 1996). In other words, language structure is adapted and shaped by the task of producing talk and meaning for others (with sequences) in human interaction in ways that give shape to a particular social world (Goodwin, 2006). Grammar, then, serves as a productive unit of analysis for understanding how, as part of a matrix of language and communicative practices, the social context of development is constituted and for understanding the importance of intersubjectivity in these processes.

There is a rich literature on the notion of intersubjectivity, but here I draw on Goodwin’s (1995) notion of intersubjectivity as shared practice, as shared practice is central to developing sets of relations that can promote learning. From this perspective, collaborative action is the home of intersubjectivity. And if grammar is at the surface of action, then it might help us understand how intersubjectivity is interactionally negotiated (C. Goodwin, personal communication, 2004) and is essential to the construction of an interactional matrix that, I argue, promotes the possibility of Third Spaces. I will briefly explore this hypothesis in a discussion of the practices of the MSLI as they help to construct a collective Third Space.

Creating a Collective Third Space

In the specific context of the MSLI, learning is supported and expanded in the language and embodied practices of the institute’s lived curriculum—a curriculum that fuses social, critical, and sociocultural theory with the local, the historical, the present, and the future of migrant communities. In this rich ecology, the learning of new concepts and skills, as well as the development of a collective identity, is facilitated through a range of language, reading, writing, and performative practices that embody or enact key concepts, emotions, and theories—the threading of conceptual metaphor, what Lakoff and Johnson (1980) call “cognitive grammar”—in instructional conversations. Of consequence, the use of hybrid language practices link the past to the present and future (particularly in reported speech about home and community) to build community and extend the means by which students can engage and make meaning. For example, as we see in Ave’s story, through syncretic *testimonio*, a central genre of the institute, participants weave autobiographical accounts, **both written and oral, across learning activity, thus situating their own lived experiences in new historicized understandings.** Students are also introduced to a range of genres that are typical

of academic writing: extended definition, persuasion, compare and contrast, personal narratives, and so on. However, each form is used in new ways oriented toward the development of a sociocritical literacy.

Taken together, this matrix of language and embodied practices helps create a social situation of development that facilitates a collective social imagination and the coordination of individual activity in the struggle for intersubjectivity (Matusov, 1996) for participants who may share a social history as migrants but who have varied trajectories and challenges. In this way, a Third Space, a zo-ped-like environment, is interactionally constituted.

The process of building a new shared vision of education and of the social circumstances of migrant communities, while acknowledging the significantly diverse trajectories of participants, partially shared objects, and the interplay of multiple activity systems at work, is difficult and complex, and there are many ongoing contradictions that need continual re-mediation. Yet, despite the tensions and contradictions—or perhaps as a result of the curriculum and pedagogy’s attention to them—participants persist in a conscious struggle for intersubjectivity, a shared vision of a new educational and social future achieved in a range of ways and degrees. This movement toward a collectively imagined, more just world is facilitated, nurtured, and re-mediated by a grammar of collective hope and possibility and a critical social imagination that sparks cognitive work and sets the ground for persistent engagement in a range of leading activities (Griffin & Cole, 1984) that constitute a framework for development in the program.

To illustrate these points and their relation to a collective Third Space, let us examine the MSLI more closely. The activity system, the MSLI, has a specific internal logic organized around expanding the students’ sociohistorical and educational ecology through the collective imagining of a new educational and sociopolitical future. To avoid the “interactional reductionism implicit in much Vygotskian-inspired research” (Nicolopoulou & Cole, 1993, p. 284), the specific interactions and practices of the MSLI are understood as what Nicolopoulou and Cole call a “genuinely collective reality” (p. 284), a genuine activity system.

Here we see the institute as an example of the Third Space, a collective zo-ped, at the larger level of activity the object of which is the sociohistorical reconstruction of what it means to be a migrant student. This movement involves a process of becoming conscious “historical actors” (Espinoza, 2003) who invoke the past in order to re-mediate it so that it becomes a resource for current and future action.

In the Vygotskian sense, the work of the Migrant Institute does not focus on students’ linguistic or academic deficiencies but on sociohistorical influences on their language, literacy, and learning practices, as well as on their social, economic, and educational realities—as Scribner (1990) observed, things mediated by the social, both proximally and concretely as well as distally and abstractly. The curriculum and its pedagogy, then, are grounded in the historical and current particulars of students’ everyday lives, while at the same time oriented toward an imagined but possible future. As an example, on any given day of the month-long program, if you were to drop into a social science or writing classroom or listen in on conversations across the range of practices that constitute life in the MSLI, the topics you would hear, the people discussed, the issues raised, would usually be presented in a way that makes clear how they are located in a history. **You would begin to understand how a historicized view of the educational and sociopolitical reality of migrant and immigrant communities helps to incite a reframing of education, of oneself, and of one’s future actions.**

To accomplish this, learning is organized in ways in which conversation, dialogue, and examination of contradictions are privileged across learning activities with varied participation structures: tutorials, comprehension circles, writing conferences, *teatro*, minilectures, and whole-class discussions. I turn to a representative moment in which Manuel, a lead instructor, has just shared, with significant passion, emotion, and detail, his own autobiography, including a digital presentation of family pictures and artifacts to tell his story. Here Manuel’s autobiography serves (1) to help students understand this genre, (2) to index his own membership in this particular community, and (3) to introduce the concept and purpose of the autobiography and the notion of its author as a historical actor. “Raise your hand if you’re a historical actor,” he asks the students, as he prompts them to begin to think about how to locate themselves and which details to marshal as they write their own autobiographies.⁹ (See the Appendix for an explanation of transcription conventions.)

Manuel: So if you have something in class that you were talking about or in the gender circles, right?=
=or at feed back at the tutoring sessions
then bring it in=
=bring it in=
use it everything that the program is=
=the curriculum isn’t only in your little- in your little notebooks=

=the curriculum is in everything that you felt and experienced and understood in whatever way from the program, okay?
(4.5) ((Turns to the projection screen at looks at the slide that is currently up))
Raise your hand if you're (.) a historical actor. ((Manuel raises his hand))

Student: A what?

Manuel: A historical actor
Raise your hand
(2.1)
You make history
(2.1)
((Some students start raising their hands))
You make history
Are you history-makers?
((More students raise their hands))
A::h see some of you are like ((Raises his hand up and down)) hey you know?=
=but everybody else is raising their hands already high too, you know?
((Raises his hand up high)) hehe
Or maybe some of you are like unsure=
=N:o, I'm not gonna raise my hand because I won't think of myself then
'kay. It's an opportunity to think about yourself as a historical actor/towards historical action
(1.0)

The process of transformation includes using a newly expanded tool kit to reframe one's own sociohistorical circumstance as a "historical actor" in ways that capture the complexities, the problems, and a hope that makes visible a solution. As Manuel said to the students later,

It does kinda make sense
'cause maybe if you start telling your story in a different way
you possibly can start li:ving (.) you know? differently
you can po- you can possibly start- start thinking about the chapters yet to come (.) you know?=
=because you still have a lot of chapters

In their writing, students begin to historicize their lives and to see themselves and their futures as historical actors. Consider, for example, Paulina's extended definition in which she begins to think about her life differently, locating it in a history, as she writes about what it means to be a migrant:

Not knowing where you come from can be devastating, not knowing where you are going and what you are destined to, can become the nightmare of your life. This is the cruel reality of an immigrant student and the history that is left behind the migration to a work of opportunities.

Thinking historically is a central theme, and that means reading and writing about texts that bring to life the reality of various forms of oppression—texts that range from Galeano's (1997) *Open Veins of Latin America: Five Centuries of the Pillage of a Continent*, Freire's (1970) *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, Anzaldúa's (1987) "How to Tame a Wild Tongue," Castillo's (1994) "A Countryless Woman," Mills's (1959/1967) *The Sociological Imagination*, and Inda's (2002) "Biopower, Reproduction, and the Migrant Woman's Body." But rather than succumbing to the sometimes unintentionally pessimistic uptake of critical pedagogies (Freire, 1998), there is a conscious attempt to find hope and possibility in new understandings that can serve as new tools for helping students read and write their way into the university as consciously historicized individuals. In the following discussion, for example, students are asked to read these texts again but differently, looking for the ways each author creates hope even while talking about the oppressive aspects of society. The students propose the idea of "praxis" as Freire's response to hope and "feminism" as Anzaldúa's. One student remarks that "just the fact that these authors are writing such books, I guess that's like hope right there," to which the instructor responds,

Manuel: Just to talk about- Again, get the pencils out=
((Raises a pencil up in his hand))
=everyone=
=get the pencil (.)
Get the pencils=
hold them u::p (.)
Get the pencils
(1.0) ((Some students raise pencils up in their hands))
Outta all the weird things we want you to do
We saw- we showed you *Fahrenheit 911*
We talked about capitalism=
=We talked about like linguistic rights and linguistic oppression=
=We talked about reproduction and biopower=
=We even had Sojourner Tru:th
and Ana Castillo, come to class (.) right?¹⁰
We wan- we talked about all these ill things that happen in society=

=and we want you to do WHAT? (0.6)
PICK UP A PE::N (.)
and write your autobiography (1.0) write
your autobiography
(1.0)
Does it make sense?

Students: ye:s yeah

Manuel: It does kinda make sense
'cause maybe if you start telling your story
in a different way
you possibly can start li:ving (.) you know?
differently
you can po- you can possibly start- start
thinking about the chapters yet to come (.)
you know?=
=because you still have a lot of chapters

Ave and her peers take up the challenge and begin to tell their stories in a different way. Ave wrote,

Slowly and painfully I began to accept myself. My fourth grade teacher, Mr. Zamora, helped me with that process as he continually admired both my writing and math skills. I was even beginning to feel proud of myself...that is...until fifth grade.

“Are you Indian?” children would ask. Some would ask in order to point out my skin color and ugliness. Others supposedly to admire my intelligence. It remained glued to the back of my head. I just didn’t belong. Once again I was encouraged to become invisible...and I did. I returned to the job of watching and learning. A job I kept at school and in my house. All I ever did was listen to everything that was told and swallowed it. This was why school was easy. I would remain quiet through classes and I would listen and this is what teachers admired the most. I memorized and that’s what people called intelligence. I wrote about my grandmother’s death, and that’s what they called good writing...so good that they gave me a medal for it. It was what Paulo Freire speaks about in the second chapter of “Pedagogy of the Oppressed”—banking education. I was a piggy bank. (Ave’s *testimonio*, July 2004)

In the Vygotskian sense, students like Ave could not only carry out the task by the end of the institute but could accomplish it in new ways, drawing on new tools, replacing one psychological function with another—yet each straining in different ways and requiring varied, persistent, and strategic assistance. Here, the mastery of cultural practices as a means toward the development of higher psychological functions is mediated by semiotic tools—a process Wells (1999) called semiotic apprenticeship.

What is not evident from these brief transcripts and writing excerpts, what is known from the large corpus of data drawn from work in the institute, are the dramatic shifts in students’ writing, academic literacy, science, knowledge of social theory and its uses, and reading comprehension.¹¹ Of equal importance, there are significant

shifts in their stance toward being legitimate members of the UCLA community. A comprehensive analysis of the 2001–03 institutes showed that almost all participants applied to a college, with 50% applying to the University of California; of these, 85% were admitted, most to Berkeley or UCLA.¹² Among a comparison group of migrant students who were selected to participate in the MSLI but who did not attend the program, 22% applied to the University of California and 75% of this group was admitted (Nunez & Jaramillo, 2004).

As I have learned from my own work, as well as from an increasing number of researchers working in the cultural–historical tradition,¹³ the historically generated practices around schooling can be re-mediated through the reorganization of learning and pedagogy, their relationships, and cultural resources for thinking. Specifically, our focus has been on developing new tools, including the syncretic *testimonio*, that promote new roles and activities and, thus, new opportunities to extend social and cognitive development, while paradoxically preparing students for the university and developing a sociocritical literacy. It is important to insert a cautionary note here: Learning in this activity system cannot be reduced to the appropriation of tools that help enhance personal growth, develop voice, or build skills, although these are arguably important byproducts; instead, the object is the constitution of what Gee (1996) calls a “social semiotic toolkit” that extends students’ repertoires of practice in ways that enable them to become designers of their own social futures.

Part of this tool kit includes ways to understand better how to respond to oppression and to the consequences of poverty. Education—that is, a particular form of critical education and learning—is offered up as one productive strategy. “With all the repression and the oppression and suffering in the world, we’re telling you to pick up books! We’re asking you to study; that’s what we do with oppression,” asserts Manuel, the instructor:

Maybe this is a beginning for us, who knows (.)
ri:ght?

Think about this place as a workshop, as a factory.
Una maqui::la (.) *pero de sueños* (.) Right?...

This is where we think about- this is your fu:ture
((Points out toward campus)) (1.2) What’s on the
o:ther si:de? ((Points at a couple of students off cam-
era)) (1.5) You kno:w? (.) You kno:w? (.) No? You
know what’s on the other side? I wanna find out
(though) (.) This is what I wanna do=

=I wanna dream our fu:ture (.) and I don’t just wan-
na dream it=

=I wanna look over what’s on the other side=

=That's the bi:g thing about drea:ming (.) Let's try
(.) Let's go see:=
=Let's see what's on the other side. ((He starts to
move away))

When we look at the words and grammatical structures in this segment, what we see is a series of choices that are meant to lead participants to a reframing of the university as a “factory of dreams” (“*maquila de sueños*”) and of their work at the university as involving their imaginations to dream their futures. The use of the word *factory* is important because working toward and imagining a new future is hard: Only this work entails thinking, imagining, questioning, reading, writing, and contemplating. Here the directives orient the students to do cognitive work. Additionally, the word *let's*, as used in “let's try,” “let's go see,” or “let's see what's on the other side,” requires students to consider collectively and individually what lies beyond the horizon: Their classes? Their futures? Such terms are often labeled as inclusive imperatives, but here I think they are inclusive directives that further emphasize the shared nature of this dreaming process (E. Ochs, personal communication, March 2005).

A Grammar of Third Spaces

Allow me to explain a bit further. Although I am neither a linguist nor a grammarian, I have been interested in examining language practices in and of learning environments, including classroom discourse practices. Understanding the affordances and constraints of the social organization of talk and interaction in classrooms has been of particular interest.¹⁴ In this work, I have been paying attention to—contrasting, if you will—a distinct set of language and communicative practices observed in programs like the Migrant Institute and in other learning environments. In these contexts, I found a frequency and density of particular grammatical structures and language practices whose function in the everyday practices of settings such as the MSLI can be distinguished from many educational interventions, both in and out of school.

To conduct my analysis, I selected representative samples of key learning activities to document what language practices were at work. I was interested in learning more about the grammatical nature of the instructional conversations characteristic of the approaches and interaction of the institute.¹⁵ Additionally, I had noted a preponderance of code switching and use of metaphor and, subsequently, documented code-switching events and metaphors used instructionally. I was particularly interested in documenting those

metaphors that referred to dreaming and to social dreaming—that is, a shared vision of a more just world now and in the future. (I will return to a discussion of social dreaming, a central metaphor of the program, shortly.) In doing the language analysis, I first accounted for the frequency of particular grammatical structures and their function in learning events across the institute. Of significance to my interest in the role of language in promoting Third Spaces, the analysis revealed a preponderance of modals, questions, volitional directives (*want/wanna*), verbs as evidentials, direct directives, and conceptual metaphors that promoted participation in shared practices and oriented students toward cognitive activity.

These are very preliminary results, but I believe that an analysis of the language and grammar of Third Spaces yields important evidence of the Third Space as a particular kind of zo-ped. If the zo-ped involves the reorganization of the past and present for future psychological functions—what Cole (1985) calls a dialogue with the future—then we can see how modals, for example, can work to facilitate this process by orienting students toward possibility. Consider that in these rich learning cycles, auxiliary modal verbs such as *may*, *will*, *could*, and *should*, for example, from a semantic point of view, were often specialized toward the expression of certain speech acts, such as giving advice, proffering suggestions for consideration, proposing possible solutions, and so on. The modals *may* and *might* also functioned to denote possibility, as did *can* and *could*, especially when combined with questions.

I noted the frequency and function of the word *hope* to express futurity and possibility and of *I want* constructions used as volitional directives (the expression of wishing that something would happen), offered in contrast to the traditional directives of many classrooms. At the same time, directives, which in their typical form contain no subject and consist of a predication with an imperative verb (e.g., *be quiet* or *sit down*), referred to some future or cognitive, contemplative action. In these cases, the hearer was urged to engage in what Shirley Brice Heath calls “headwork for the future” (personal communication, January 2005) through mental-state verbs that project into the future, such as *imagine*, *try*, *let's*, *find*, *follow*, and *raise*. There were also a number of phrases that had the sense of being directives, such as *asking/telling you to pick up books* and *that's what you're gonna be working with or reading this month*. Question-asking by instructors was pervasive throughout the discourse; however, these were not known-answer questions but rather were used to confirm or check for understanding, to build consensus, or to build a shared understanding and were often represented by a rising intonation.

I use these examples to help us consider how the language practices and the grammatical accounts observed in a particular activity system, the surrounding discourse, and coordinated bodily practice create an interactional matrix that serves as a resource for constituting a social situation of development with particular types of activities, relations, and opportunities for movement across past, present, and future roles and practices (Ochs et al., 1996). Specifically, the language and embodied practices mediated the accomplishment of shared practices among the participants that functioned instrumentally to help students link the past and present to an imagined future and reorganize everyday concepts acquired through social interaction in joint activities into scientific or school-based concepts in ways that created a collective Third Space.

Taken together, these language practices (including hybrid language practices; see Gutiérrez, Baquedano-López, & Tejada, 1999), the conscious use of social theory, play and the imagination (through *teatro del oprimido*), high-level texts in Spanish only as well as Spanish and English, guided questions that help students enter difficult texts, writing for learning and for social action as well as for the academy, dialogue, and conceptual metaphors help to construct a “grammar” of the institute that mediates participants’ learning and development. Collectively, these tools also serve as the means for developing a historicizing literacy that links students’ historical and immediate past, the present, and the imagined future through social dreaming—a collective dream for a better world.

Shared Practice as Shared Vision

Social dreaming, a concept rooted in Freire (1970), serves as a central conceptual metaphor elaborated throughout the course of the MSLI (Espinoza, 2004)—in everyday and classroom language, the embodied concepts of *teatro*, the texts, and other related metaphors—to accomplish several goals: (1) to facilitate understanding of discussions, as well as the difficult texts participants read and write, (2) to facilitate the reorganization of everyday concepts into scientific concepts, and (3) to help students redefine both the “world as it is today” and the “world as it could be.”

The repetition and threading of powerful and meaningful metaphors throughout talk in the MSLI provide both the conceptual glue across the everyday practices of the program and the means for building a shared vision of the future. This is significant as conceptual metaphors are not simply words, they are tied to metaphorical thinking, reasoning, and “if-then” hypotheticals. And if inference is at the heart of metaphor, as

Lakoff and Johnson (1980) suggest, then the value of metaphorical language grounded in the particulars of students’ lives and texts in building scientific concepts becomes more evident.

The following vignette shows the introduction of the key metaphor of social dreaming to the students on the second day of the program, their first day of class. Through the use of conceptual metaphors, with play and imagination as leading activities, the reframing of education begins.

As the students are walking to class, escorted by the entire instructional and residential staff, they come across one of their instructors feigning sleep on the path to their classroom. He tells them he’s been dreaming and asks them what they dream about, and a discussion about their dreams ensues. There are a variety of student responses, including statements such as “Like things that I can’t really do now but I want to” and “I dream of flying,” which are taken up in the joint construction of a definition of social dreaming.

This is a powerful segment, in which participants engage in a discussion about dreaming, moving from an individual notion of dreaming—“wishing for three houses and a Yukon [sports utility vehicle]”—to a collective form of dreaming, a social dream for a better educational and social future for the migrant and larger community. Part of the discussion includes an account of how the students came to be sitting on the ground at this campus, the first in their families to participate in a university setting like UCLA. “We’re our parents’ dream in lots of ways,” they are told by staff members. “You’re the realization of someone’s dream. A lot of people had to do a lot of dreaming to get you here, and a lot of people had to do a lot of work to make those dreams come true in order to have you here.”

In this discussion, students also participate in an imaginary situation where they are children once again, but children with the power to create a world where education is different. Through *teatro*, they also grieve collectively over the death of a 12-year-old African American boy, whose body had been found recently in a trash container in south Los Angeles and who, through the imagination, is brought back to life to be honored and remembered. As they are about to receive their course readers, they engage in a brief *teatro* act in which they attempt to fly by flapping their arms, their “wings”; the metaphors of flying and wings are used to reframe the leading activity of learning, reading their course texts as “flying with our minds” and the course readers themselves as “wings” and “tools” (*herramientas*). Reading books becomes the vehicle by which dreams can come true. Here the use of Spanish and of Spanish and English texts, along with encouragement to use whatever lan-

guage is necessary to read, write, and think, makes Spanish an unmarked language.

Of significance across the data set collected from the MSLI is how language elaborated by a number of co-occurring signs, including conceptual metaphors and a range of embodied displays across the program's activities, shows how the accomplishment of joint action is also a central environment for cognitive activity. In this way, as Goodwin (2006) argues, language structure, gesture, and the social organization of talk, interaction, and space provide a central resource for the organization of joint cognitive and social activity dynamically achieved in a social environment.

For example, through metaphor, the playful imagination, and the use of Spanish to connect home, community, and the past with present and future action, the collective nature of social dreaming was enacted in a subsequent event as students collaboratively experience an aspect of social dreaming: the collective and difficult work of imagining and creating a more just world. In this embodied learning activity, one student, Juan, "flies" through an educational institution with the help of his peers to help create a social situation of development that is simultaneously historical, critical, local, collective, and individual. Juan's peers and instructors physically carry him up a steep and long set of stairs, his body lifted four feet off the ground. Because carrying Juan up the incline is difficult, peers regularly need to jump in to help one another complete the journey, just as they will need to do to help one another "fly" through the difficult journey of the academic world.

Near the beginning of this scene, Juan, poised like Superman ready to fly, asks sheepishly, "How do I fly?" Manuel, the instructor, answers, "Find a way. Right? He said, 'Como?' He said, 'How?'" And the students laugh. "That's the question! *Es la pregunta*. How? Exactly how do we fly? How do we socially dream?" Here Manuel turns Juan's question into a means of connecting the present to the hypothetical and to the larger question of this *teatro* activity that serves as a workshop for the kind of problem solving students will do as they figure out how to dream socially, collectively. "That's what we're gonna talk about for a month. We can't do it, you can't do it by yourself. It's gonna take everybody. Let's try to make Juan fly. Social dreaming is hard."

As this vignette illustrates, the Migrant Institute takes an ecological approach to learning and, thus, opportunities for learning are created in natural activity across the day, in residential life, at meal times, during the long walk up the path from the dorms to the classroom, in tutorials, in recreational time, during *teatro del oprimido*, in gender circles, and in numerous spontaneous events.

However, the emerging understandings and concepts are always elaborated in formal instructional activity.

One opportunistic event to enact social theory, to collectively problem solve, and to begin to build new identities as members of the UCLA community emerged before students had even participated in their first formal class. As the students continued their trek across campus, rather than being able to pursue their planned path, the group found the entire area converted to a cheerleading camp filled with hundreds of bouncing teenage girls from around the state. The instructors seized the opportunity to introduce students to social theory and a pragmatic form of social analysis grounded in their everyday experience. The blocked pathway that altered the group's intended route became symbolic of the obstacles students encounter throughout their month at UCLA and their lives. First, the instructional staff detailed a range of options to solve the problem of what to do when obstacles are encountered and instructed the students to think symbolically about all the things that get in their way in everyday life. In this case, the obstacles were people, but the instructors directed the students to think metaphorically, as the barriers discussed throughout the MSLI are social structures and a societal system that impede progress toward a new social reality. In this particular instance, students were directed to smile and walk confidently around the cheerleaders, taking a new course toward their destination and, metaphorically, a new trajectory educationally and sociopolitically. By reframing this space as theirs, with the right to inhabit the spaces that constitute UCLA, students, with the assistance of the instructional staff, began an apprenticeship in which they learned how to respond to the daily taunts and name-calling like "Illegals, Mexicans, go home" that they experience as they move around the campus. These real events later became the content of theater of the oppressed designed as part of the migrant curriculum.

This apprenticeship in not conceding space is an important developmental task that these migrant students—and certainly immigrants, especially indigenous people—face. Such strategies and forms of horizontal learning are rarely part of the tool kit acquired in most formal learning situations. If we consider how many domestic workers, janitors in our office buildings, and workers in the hotels that hold our professional conferences move out of the pathway of others with their eyes averted, we can begin to understand that such practices have a long history in oppression and are in need of remediation (Cole & Griffin, 1986).

Through such embodied cognitive activities and a rich interactional matrix of language practices, learning becomes situated, reciprocal, and distributed, leading to new forms of learning, a reframing of the role of

education and of the self as a historical actor, and the development of an important set of tools that facilitates social and cognitive activity. By exploiting the dialectic between the individual and the social, between the world as it is and the world as it could be, we see that institutions of learning can be transformed.

The task of the Migrant Institute is to design, facilitate, document, and push forward productive cycles of learning, while accepting, reflecting on, and re-mediating the ongoing contradictions and problems made visible by the social theory elaborated in the program's coursework and the students' own lived experiences. As institute instructors, drawing on Engeström (1987, 2001), have noted, the pedagogy and curriculum of the program are designed to create opportunities to collectively generate new forms of joint activity to solve the double binds students encounter throughout their lives as immigrants, migrants, and adolescents. These are the processes that help to constitute a collective Third Space.

The push and pull involved in building a collective dream, of struggling for intersubjectivity mediated by the appropriation of tools that extend students' repertoires of practice, helps to account for students' persistent engagement in educational activity during the MSLI. The design of this particular social situation of development forces students to strain against their own levels of competence and experience and helps to account, in part, for their subsequent achievement in school and as community leaders and for their persistence in dreaming socially in their own unique ways. Yet, despite their extraordinary achievement and transformation in the institute and their documented postinstitute achievement, the students return to schools and communities in which gross inequities and un-re-mediated environments are normative. However, their own words, texts, continued communication, and trajectories reveal how the development of critical social thought in which they individually and collectively reconceive their past, present, and future serves as a potent mediator in academic and everyday activity.

The story of the UCLA Migrant Student Leadership Institute, as an exemplar of a collective Third Space, should not be considered a utopian narrative, as work in these spaces is difficult and filled with contradictions, setbacks, and struggle. It remains unfinished work. It is, however, an example of what is possible when educators and educational researchers arrange educational environments in ways that incite, support, and extend students' repertoires of practice by organizing the frequency, co-occurrence, and difficulty of cultural practices and forms of mediation (Laboratory of Comparative Human Cognition, 1983) and by persisting in the strug-

gle for intersubjectivity toward a new vision of education and the world.

I end this article by returning to words of a wise migrant student, this time a young man who illustrates in his syncretic *testimonio* the power of a historicizing education, hybrid language practices, and a sociocritical literacy in the accomplishment of a Third Space and in reframing education for students from nondominant communities. In his bilingual and hybrid text, David recounts his difficulty adjusting to life in the U.S. and then writes about his decision to attend the institute and the transformation he experienced as a result.

Los años pasaron y me acostumbre a los EE.UU. y en Junio del 2004 tuve una gran oportunidad. Tuve la oportunidad de venir al MSLI y aquí es donde descubrí el significado de la luz que miraba en el fondo de la cueva que mire cuando mi papá me preguntó que si me quería venir. La luz significa una nueva vida que estoy a punto de empezar, mi deseo de ayudar a mis padres, mi deseo de que mis padres y hermanos estén orgullosos de mi y de ser el primero en la familia en graduarse de la universidad. [The years passed and I became accustomed to the United States and in June 2004 I had a great opportunity. I had the opportunity to come to MSLI and here is where I learned the significance of the light that I saw in the bottom of the cave that I saw when my father asked me if I wanted to come. The light signifies a new life that I am about to begin, my desire to help my parents, my hope that my parents and brothers and sisters will be proud of me and to be the first in the family to graduate from the university.]

Also, the MSLI helped me to understand who I am.

I am a hard working student.

I am my parents' hope.

I am a person who has a goal.

I am a story to be written.

And the most important thing

I am a hard worker's son.

Finally, I am the author of my life and I will live to write the successes of my life. This story will continue...

Notes

¹ The view of equity in this article is distinguished from discourses on equality and resulting practices. Informed by critical race theory (Crenshaw, Gotanda, Peller, & Thomas, 1995) and Crosland's (2004) work, a race-based equity reform approach focuses on the source of the problem—that is, the underlying historical practices that have contributed to creating inequity—toward some transformative end. The standpoint emanates from the nondominant community.

² For the past three decades, I have been involved at several universities in the development and administration of social design experiments for students from nondominant communities. There is a long history of such programs emerging from civil rights movements and from the Chicano civil rights movement in particular (Muñoz, 1989). The programs I have developed were conceived as political projects immersed in rigorous intellectual work oriented toward participants'

political empowerment through education. The program discussed here is an example of a more recent effort growing out of my earlier work and the collective body of similar efforts over the past decades. Because of health issues, I last directed the program described here in summer 2006.

³The term *nondominant* is used here instead of the more common *minority*, *diverse*, or *of color*. In discussion preceding preparation of the original 2005 lecture from which this article is derived, a group of us working in the UCLA migrant program identified *nondominant* as better communicating issues of power and power relations than do traditional terms.

⁴See V.V. Davydov's *Problems of Development Teaching*, excerpts from which are reprinted in Davydov (1988a, 1988b, 1988c, 1988d, 1988e).

⁵All names are pseudonyms, with the exception of Manuel, who asked that his real name be used.

⁶One relevant context for the development of many of the practices of MSLI is a 5th Dimension after-school computer club, UC Links *Las Redes*, in a port-of-entry school district in Los Angeles that serves African American, immigrant Mexican, and Pacific Islander students (Cole, 1996; Cole & Griffin, 1980; Vasquez, 2003).

⁷This science is very different from the traditional science curriculum. It is taught by Latino medical students who, with assistance, develop a deeply meaningful science curriculum around the health issues of the migrant community.

⁸The concept of the Third Space first used in work reported in Gutiérrez et al. (1995) did not draw upon other well-known conceptions of the Third Space. At the time, we had not read Bhabha's (1994) work and my colleague Soja (1996) and I knew nothing of each other's use of the concept.

⁹Learning in this ecology is distributed and embedded across a range of practices in which joint activity is privileged. I use representative moments of classroom events selected to illustrate, in part, how a collective Third Space is achieved. An exhaustive discussion would include the characteristic dialogue that occurs among students and between students and the instructional staff in the literacy classrooms, comprehension or gender circles, writing conferences, tutorials, *teatro*, and the long treks from the dorms to the indoor and outdoor classrooms.

¹⁰Historical figures appeared through *teatro* activities.

¹¹Many of the high school students who participate in the MSLI have never been assigned to write an extensive essay or to read an entire book. In this program, they are required to read, discuss, and write about college, even graduate-level, texts.

¹²Ave, Juan, and David, the students whose work is highlighted in this article, were all admitted to and attend prestigious universities.

¹³See, for example, the work of Luis Moll, Michael Cole, Yrjo Engeström, Olga Vásquez, Barbara Rogoff, Richard Duran, Shirley Brice Heath, Mike Rose, Alfredo Artiles, Robert Rueda, Norma Gonzalez, Allan Luke, Brian Street, Glynda Hull, Angela Arzubíaga, and Carol Lee.

¹⁴Of relevance is the development of a protocol to codify the social organization of learning and talk in classrooms (Gutiérrez, Berlin, Crosland, & Razfar, 1999). These analyses have used conversational analytic features to identify participation structures, instructional scripts, and the social organization of talk.

¹⁵Activity logs were completed for each videotape collected in each year's program; in these logs, activity was documented in two-minute intervals. These activity logs were subsequently coded.

Representative samples of practices were identified in this process. Key, representative learning events were transcribed.

This article was first presented as the Sylvia Scribner Award Lecture entitled "Intersubjectivity and the Grammar of the Third Space" at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Montreal, Quebec, Canada, on April 13, 2005. I would like to acknowledge a number of colleagues who were instrumental in the development of the lecture version of this article—Mike Rose, Mike Cole, Chuck Goodwin, Candy Goodwin, Shirley Brice Heath, Marjorie Orellana, Elinor Ochs, Fred Erickson, Noel Enyedy, Carol Lee, Yrjo Engeström, Inma Garcia, Laurie Schick, Shirin Vossoughi, Esmeralda Martin, and Manuel Espinoza. I give special acknowledgment to "Ave," "Juan," and "David," and to all those who have contributed to the UCLA Migrant Student Leadership Institute.

References

- Appiah, K.A. (2006). *Cosmopolitanism: Ethics in a world of strangers*. New York: Norton.
- Atkinson, J.M., & Heritage, J. (Eds.). (1984). *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Bell, D., Roach, P.B., & Sheets, G. (1994). The nation's invisible families: Living in the stream. *Rural Educator*, 15(3), 27–30.
- Bhabha, H.K. (1994). *The location of culture*. London: Routledge.
- Brown, A.L., Ash, D., Rutherford, M., Nakagawa, K., Gordon, A., & Campione, J.C. (1993). Distributed expertise in the classroom. In G. Salomon (Ed.), *Distributed cognitions: Psychological and educational considerations* (pp. 188–228). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Chaiklin, S. (2003). The zone of proximal development in Vygotsky's analysis of learning and instruction. In A. Kozulin, B. Gindis, V.S. Ageyev, & S.M. Miller (Eds.), *Vygotsky's educational theory in cultural context* (pp. 39–64). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Cole, M. (1985). The zone of proximal development: Where culture and cognition create each other. In J.V. Wertsch (Ed.), *Culture, communication, and cognition: Vygotskian perspectives* (pp. 146–161). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Cole, M. (1996). *Cultural psychology: A once and future discipline*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Cole, M., & Engeström, Y. (1993). A cultural-historical approach to distributed cognition. In G. Salomon (Ed.), *Distributed cognitions: Psychological and educational considerations* (pp. 1–46). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Cole, M., & Griffin, P. (1980). Cultural amplifiers reconsidered. In D.R. Olson (Ed.), *The social foundations of language and thought: Essays in honor of Jerome S. Bruner* (pp. 343–364). New York: Norton.
- Cole, M., & Griffin, P. (1986). A sociohistorical approach to remediation. In S. de Castell, A. Luke, & K. Egan (Eds.), *Literacy, society, and schooling: A reader* (pp. 110–131). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Crenshaw, K., Gotanda, N., Peller, G., & Thomas, K. (Eds.). (1995). *Critical race theory: The key writings that formed the movement*. New York: New Press.
- Crosland, K. (2004, April 13). *Colorblind desegregation: Race neutral remedies as the new "equal opportunity"*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Diego, CA.
- Cruz, C. (2006). Testimonial narratives of queer street youth: Toward an epistemology of a brown body. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 68(02). (University Microfilms No. 3251434)

- Cruz, C. (2007, October 26). *How much do you think this body's worth? Notes on bodies and street ethnography*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Studies Association, Cleveland, OH.
- Davydov, V.V. (1988a). The basic concepts of contemporary psychology [chapter 1, *Problems of developmental teaching*]. *Soviet Education*, 30(8), 15–43.
- Davydov, V.V. (1988b). Problems of the child's mental development [chapter 2, *Problems of developmental teaching*]. *Soviet Education*, 30(8), 44–97.
- Davydov, V.V. (1988c). Learning activity in the younger school age period [chapter 5, *Problems of developmental teaching*]. *Soviet Education*, 30(9), 3–47.
- Davydov, V.V. (1988d). The mental development of younger schoolchildren in the process of learning activity [chapter 6, *Problems of developmental teaching*]. *Soviet Education*, 30(9), 48–83.
- Davydov, V.V. (1988e). The mental development of younger schoolchildren in the process of learning activity (continued) [chapter 6, *Problems of developmental teaching*]. *Soviet Education*, 30(10), 3–36.
- Engeström, Y. (1987). *Learning by expanding: An activity-theoretical approach to developmental research*. Helsinki, Finland: Orienta-Konsultit Oy.
- Engeström, Y. (1994). The working health center project: Materializing zones of proximal development in a network of organizational learning. In T. Kauppinen & M. Lahtonen (Eds.), *Action research in Finland*. Helsinki, Finland: Ministry of Labour.
- Engeström, Y. (1996). Development as breaking away and opening up: A challenge to Vygotsky and Piaget. *Swiss Journal of Psychology*, 55, 126–132.
- Engeström, Y. (2001). Expansive learning at work: Toward an activity theoretical reconceptualization. *Journal of Education and Work*, 14, 133–156.
- Engeström, Y. (2005). *Developmental work research: Expanding activity theory in practice* (Vol. 12). Berlin, Germany: Lehmanns Media.
- Espinoza, M. (2003). *UCLA Statewide Migrant Student Institute curriculum*. Los Angeles: University of California, Los Angeles.
- Espinoza, M. (2004). *UCLA Statewide Migrant Student Institute curriculum*. Los Angeles: University of California, Los Angeles.
- Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Seabury.
- Freire, P. (1998). *Teachers as cultural workers: Letters to those who dare teach* (D.P. Macedo, D. Koike, & A. Oliveira, Trans.). Boulder, CO: Westview.
- Gee, J.P. (1996). *Social linguistics and literacies: Ideology in discourses* (2nd ed.). London: Taylor & Francis.
- Goffman, E. (1961). *Asylums: Essays on the social situation of mental patients and other inmates*. Garden City, NY: Anchor.
- Goodwin, C. (1995). Co-constructing meaning in conversations with an aphasic man. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 28, 233–260.
- Goodwin, C. (2006). Human sociality as mutual orientation in a rich interactive environment: Multimodal utterances and pointing in aphasia. In N.J. Enfield & S.C. Levinson (Eds.), *Roots of human sociality: Culture, cognition and interaction* (pp. 97–125). Oxford, England: Berg.
- Griffin, P., & Cole, M. (1984). Current activity for the future: The zoped. In B. Rogoff & J.V. Wertsch (Eds.), *Children's learning in the "zone of proximal development": New directions for child development* (pp. 45–63). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Griffin, P., & Cole, M. (1987). New technologies, basic skills, and the underside of education: What is to be done? In J.A. Langer (Ed.), *Language, literacy, and culture: Issues of society and schooling* (pp. 199–231). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Gutiérrez, K. (1993, April). *Scripts, counterscripts, and multiple scripts*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Atlanta, GA.
- Gutiérrez, K. (1994, July). *Scripts, counterscripts, and the construction of context in literacy activities for elementary school-aged Latino children: Perspectives on literacy, schooling and power*. Paper presented at the XIII World Congress of Sociology, Bielefeld, Germany.
- Gutiérrez, K. (1995, June). *Script, counterscript, and underlife in the urban classroom: Constructing a Third Space*. Paper presented at the Fourth International Literacy and Education Research Network Conference on Learning, Townsville, QLD, Australia.
- Gutiérrez, K. (2002, November). *Rethinking critical literacy in hard times: Critical literacy as transformative social practice*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Council of Teachers of English, Atlanta, GA.
- Gutiérrez, K. (2004). Literacy as laminated activity: Rethinking literacy for English learners. In J. Worthy, B. Maloch, J.V. Hoffman, D.L. Schallert, & C.M. Fairbanks (Eds.), *53rd yearbook of the National Reading Conference* (pp. 101–114). Oak Creek, WI: National Reading Conference.
- Gutiérrez, K., Baquedano-López, P., & Tejada, C. (1999). Rethinking diversity: Hybridity and hybrid language practices in the third space. *Mind, Culture, and Activity*, 6, 286–303.
- Gutiérrez, K., Berlin, D., Crosland, K., & Razfar, A. (1999). *Social organization of learning classroom observation protocol*. Los Angeles: Center for the Study of Urban Literacies, Graduate School of Education and Information Studies, University of California, Los Angeles.
- Gutiérrez, K., & Jaramillo, N.E. (2006). Looking for educational equity: The consequences of relying on *Brown*. In A. Ball (Ed.), *With more deliberate speed: Achieving equity and excellence in education—Realizing the full potential of Brown v. Board of Education* (Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Vol. 105, Issue 2, pp. 173–189). Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Gutiérrez, K., & Larson, J. (2007). Discussing expanded spaces for learning [Profiles and Perspectives]. *Language Arts*, 85, 69–77.
- Gutiérrez, K., & Rogoff, B. (2003). Cultural ways of learning: Individual traits or repertoires of practice. *Educational Researcher*, 32(5), 19–25.
- Gutiérrez, K.D., Rymes, B., & Larson, J. (1995). Script, counterscript, and underlife in the classroom: James Brown versus *Brown v. Board of Education*. *Harvard Educational Review*, 65, 445–471.
- Hamilton, M. (1997). Keeping alive alternative visions. In J.-P. Hautecoeur (Ed.), *Alpha 97: Basic education and institutional environments* (P. Sutton, Trans.). Hamburg, Germany: UNESCO Institute for Education.
- Huang, G. (1993). *Health problems among migrant farmworkers' children in the U.S.* Charleston, WV: ERIC Clearinghouse on Rural Education and Small Schools. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED357907)
- Jaramillo, N. (2007). *Nepantla pedagogy: Unpacking urban schools and social dramas from the standpoint of Las Madres of Mirasur*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles.
- Kulick, D., & Stroud, C. (1993). Conceptions and uses of literacy in a Papua New Guinean village. In B.V. Street (Ed.), *Cross-cultural approaches to literacy* (pp. 30–61). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Laboratory of Comparative Human Cognition. (1983). Culture and cognition. In P.H. Mussen (Ed.), *Handbook of child psychology: Vol. 1. History, theory, and methods* (pp. 295–355). New York: Wiley.
- Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors we live by*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

- Luke, A. (2003). After the marketplace: Evidence, social science and educational research. *The Australian Educational Researcher*, 9(2), 87–108.
- Matusov, E. (1996). Intersubjectivity without agreement. *Mind, Culture, and Activity*, 3, 25–45.
- Moje, E.B., Ciechanowski, K.M., Kramer, K., Ellis, L., Carrillo, R., & Collazo, T. (2004). Working toward third space in content area literacy: An examination of everyday funds of knowledge and Discourse. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 39, 38–70.
- Moll, L.C. (1990). Introduction. In L.C. Moll (Ed.), *Vygotsky and education: Instructional implications and applications of sociohistorical psychology* (pp. 1–27). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Moll, L.C., & Greenberg, J.B. (1990). Creating zones of possibilities: Combining social contexts for instruction. In L.C. Moll (Ed.), *Vygotsky and education: Instructional implications and applications of sociohistorical psychology* (pp. 319–348). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Muñoz, C., Jr. (1989). *Youth, identity, power: The Chicano movement*. New York: Verso.
- Nicolopoulou, A., & Cole, M. (1993). Generation and transmission of shared knowledge in the culture of collaborative learning: The fifth dimension, its play-world, and its institutional context. In E.A. Forman, N. Minick, & C.A. Stone (Eds.), *Contexts for learning: sociocultural dynamics in children's development* (pp. 283–314). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Nunez, A., & Jaramillo, N. (2004). *Evaluation report: The effects of the UCLA Migrant Student Leadership Institute on students' college-going trajectories*. Los Angeles: Center for the Study of Urban Literacies, Graduate School of Education and Information Studies, University of California, Los Angeles.
- Ochs, E., Schegloff, E.A., & Thompson, S.A. (1996). *Interaction and grammar*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Oregon Health & Science University. (2001). Reducing pesticide exposure in minority families. Retrieved February 8, 2008, from www.ohsu.edu/croet/aghealth/family.html
- Scollon, R., & Scollon, S.W. (2003). *Discourses in place: Language in the material world*. London: Routledge.
- Scribner, S. (1990). Reflections on a model. *The Quarterly Newsletter of the Laboratory of Comparative Human Cognition*, 12, 90–94.
- Soja, E.W. (1996). *Thirdspace: Journeys to Los Angeles and other real-and-imagined places*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Stoll, D. (1999). *Rigoberta Menchú and the story of all poor Guatemalans*. Boulder, CO: Westview.
- Street, B.V. (2005). Introduction: New literacy studies and literacies across educational contexts. In B.V. Street (Ed.), *Literacies across educational contexts: Mediating learning and teaching* (pp. 1–21). Philadelphia: Caslon.
- Tuomi-Gröhn, T. (2003). Developmental transfer as a goal of internship in practical nursing. In T. Tuomi-Gröhn & Y. Engeström (Eds.), *Between school and work: New perspectives on transfer and boundary-crossing* (pp. 199–232). Amsterdam: Pergamon.
- Tuomi-Gröhn, T., & Engeström, Y. (2003). *Between school and work: New perspectives on transfer and boundary-crossing*. Amsterdam: Pergamon.
- Tuomi-Gröhn, T., & Engeström, Y., & Young, M. (2003). From transfer to boundary-crossing between school and work as a tool for developing vocational education: An introduction. In T. Tuomi-Gröhn & Y. Engeström (Eds.), *Between school and work: New perspectives on transfer and boundary-crossing* (pp. 1–15). Amsterdam: Pergamon.
- United Nations Development Programme. (2001). *Human development report 2001: Making new technologies work for human development*. New York: Oxford University Press. Retrieved December 28, 2007, from hdr.undp.org/en/reports/global/hdr2001/
- Vásquez, O.A. (2003). *La clase mágica: Imagining optimal possibilities in a bilingual community of learners*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Vygotsky, L.S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes* (M. Cole, V. John-Steiner, S. Scribner, & E. Souberman, Eds. & Trans.). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Wells, G. (1999). *Dialogic inquiry: Toward a sociocultural practice and theory of education*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Literature Cited

- Anzaldúa, G. (1987). How to tame a wild tongue. In *Borderlands/La frontera: The new mestiza* (pp. 53–59). San Francisco: Aunt Lute.
- Castillo, A. (1994). A countryless woman. In *Massacre of the dreamers: Essays on Xicanisma* (pp. 21–43). Albuquerque, NM: University of New Mexico Press.
- Galeano, E. (1997). *Open veins of Latin America: Five centuries of the pillage of a continent* (C. Belfrage, Trans.). New York: Monthly Review.
- Inda, J.X. (2002). Biopower, reproduction, and the migrant woman's body. In A.J. Aldama & N.H. Quiñonez (Eds.), *Decolonial voices: Chicana and Chicano cultural studies in the 21st century* (pp. 98–112). Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Mills, C.W. (1967). *The sociological imagination*. New York: Oxford University Press. (Original work published 1959)

Submitted September 12, 2007

Final revision received December 3, 2007

Accepted December 5, 2007

Kris D. Gutiérrez teaches in the Division of Social Research Methodology, University of California, Los Angeles, USA; e-mail krisgu@ucla.edu.

Appendix

The following transcription conventions, adapted from Atkinson and Heritage (1984), are used in the examples given:

- Colons denote sound stretch (U::m”)
- Underlining denotes emphatic stress (“Don’t shout out”)
- Brackets indicate overlapping speech—for example,
Student: [It’s clean now
Teacher: [Na::w, it’s a good guess
- Equal signs indicate closely latched speech or ideas—for example,
Teacher: Someone=
Someone: =Michael Jackson
- Intervals of silence are timed in tenths of seconds and inserted within parentheses; short, untimed

silences are marked by a hyphen when sound is quickly cut off (e.g., “We’ve got a- current events quiz”) or with a period within parentheses (.).

- Rising intonation within an utterance is marked with an upward arrow (e.g., “to ↑ start with”); utterance with final rising intonation is marked with a question mark, continued intonation with a comma, and falling intonation with a period
- Degree signs indicate lowered volume (e.g., “°you shut up°”); items written entirely in uppercase letters are of a higher volume (“HAH HAH”)
- Descriptions of speech are italicized within double parentheses [e.g., ((*imitating*)) No:::]
- Single parentheses surround items of doubtful transcription
- Boldface indicates items of analytic focus